



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,144	03/11/2004	Hideyuki Kaneko	1188-0118P	7454
2252	7590	12/09/2008	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			MULLIS, JEFFREY C	
PO BOX 747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			1796	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/09/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/797,144	Applicant(s) KANEKO ET AL.
	Examiner Jeffrey C. Mullis	Art Unit 1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 2,4,5 and 7-11 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 2,4,5 and 7-11 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-166/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2-20-07

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

All previous rejections are hereby withdrawn.

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claims 2, 4 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase in claim 2 "(A4) having a number average molecular weight (Mn) of 500 to 1,000,000" could be interpreted as referring to "(A4)" or to P superscript 2 and it is therefore unclear whether the molecular weight refers to the polar polymer chain or only the polyolefin side chain.

"(T)he polymer having a functional group" as recited in claim 4 in "Process S-1" lacks antecedent basis within this claim.

The term "(co)polymerization" as recites in claim 4 generally indicates in the art a process of either homopolymerization or alternatively copolymerization and as process S-2 otherwise requires polymerization of a combination of addition polymerizable monomer, ring opening polymerizable monomer and macromers, copolymerization is required and is not an alternative to homopolymerization. If the term "(co)polymerizing" refers to copolymerization of "addition polymerizable monomer" it is not clear why singular "an" and "monomer" only is recited. Presumably monomers D, E and M are all required by claim 4 to be polymerized. If so the above rejection may be overcome by

Art Unit: 1796

changing "an addition-polymerizable monomer" to "addition-polymerizable monomer(s)" to indicate that D, E and M all must be polymerized in process S-2 but that more than one monomer "D" may be polymerized in the process.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 4, 5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Ziegler (US 2,699,457).

Patentees disclose a material having polyethylene chains bound to aluminum (column 1, lines 33-45 an column 2, lines 19-25). Patentees imply that the molecular weights are 10,000-30,000 at column 8, lines 55-65 and also implies high molecular weights based on stoichiometry at column 2, lines 10-15.

Product-by-process claims are not rejected using the approach set out in Graham v. Deere. It is applicant's burden to show that there is a non-obvious difference between the product of a product-by-process claim and a prior art product which reasonably appears to be the same or only slightly different whether or not the prior art product is produced in the same manner as the claimed product. Note In re Marosi, 218 USPQ 289, 292-293 (CAFC 1983); In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972) and In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985) in this regard.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey C. Mullis at telephone number 571 272 1075.

Jeffrey C. Mullis
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1796

JCM

12-3-08

/Jeffrey C. Mullis/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796